



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,611	10/03/2006	Mauro Barbieri	FR 040041	1594
24737 7590 10/28/2010 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
TORRENTE, RICHARD T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2482				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/599,611

Applicant(s)

BARBIERI ET AL.

Examiner

RICHARD TORRENTE

Art Unit

2482

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/3/06 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-5 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of copending Application No. 10/599,631. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current application 10/599,611 discloses all essential elements and processes that are obvious over copending application 10/599,631.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The USPTO interim guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in Sec. 101.

... a signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of Sec. 101.

... signal claims are ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes of Sec. 101.

Claim(s) 4 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 4 is drawn to functional descriptive material recorded on a machine readable medium. Normally, the claim would be statutory. However, the specification discloses subject matter that encompasses non-statutory subject matter.

Because the full scope of the claim as properly read in light of the disclosure encompasses non-statutory subject matter, the claim as a whole is non-statutory. The examiner suggests amending the claim to *include* the language "**non-transitory**" before the phrase "**machine readable storage medium**" to include the disclosed tangible computer readable media, while at the same time *excluding* the intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, etc. Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

4. Claim(s) 5 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim(s) 5 defines SIGNAL with descriptive material. While "functional descriptive material" may be claimed as a statutory product (i.e., a "manufacture") when embodied on a tangible computer readable medium, a

"signal" and "carrier wave" embodying functional descriptive material is neither a process nor a product (i.e., a tangible "thing") and therefore does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of § 101. Rather, "signal" is a form of energy, in the absence of any physical structure or tangible material.

Drawings

5. Figure(s) 1 is/are objected to as depicting a block diagram without "readily identifiable" directional flow of each block, as required by 37 CFR 1.84(n). Rule 84(n) requires "labeled representations" of graphical symbols, such as arrow heads; and any that are "not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable." In the case of Figure(s) 1, the directional flows of the blocks are not readily identifiable per se and therefore require the insertion of arrow heads identifying the flow of those blocks.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Coding Method Applied to Monochrome Image in Multimedia Data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeannin (US 2003/0123841 A1) in view of Ishikawa et al. (US 5,493,345).

Regarding claim 1, Jeannin discloses a coding method for coding digital video data available in the form of a video stream comprising consecutive frames divided into macroblocks themselves subdivided into contiguous blocks, said frames being coded in the form of at least I-frames, independently coded according to a coding mode said intra, P-frames, temporally disposed between said I-frames and predicted from at least a previous I- or P-frame, and B-frames, temporally disposed between an I-frame and a P-frame, or between two P-frames, and bidirectionally predicted from at least these two frames between which they are disposed (see MPEG and GOP in ¶ [0018]-[0020]), said coding method comprising the following steps: a structuring step, provided for capturing, for all the successive macroblocks of the current frame (see ¶ [0020]), related coding parameters characterizing the fact that they have been coded, or not, according to a predetermined intra prediction mode (see ¶ [0028]); a computing step, for delivering, for said current frame, statistics related to said parameters (see ¶ [0029]); an analyzing step, provided for analyzing said statistics and for determining the blocks of said current frame which exhibit, or not, said intra prediction mode (see ¶ [0005]); a detecting step, provided for detecting, the occurrence of an image, or of a sub-region of an image, which is either monochrome (see ¶ [0005]) or with a repetitive pattern; a description step, provided for generating description data of said occurrences of images or sub-images either monochrome or with a repetitive pattern (see fig. 3); a coding step, provided for encoding the description data thus obtained and the original digital video data (see 14 in fig. 2).

Although Jeannin discloses determining if an image is a monochrome image based on DC coefficient with scene change (see ¶ [0005] and [0028]), it is noted that Jeannin does not disclose wherein the determination is based on the number of blocks of said current frame, and each time said number is greater than a given threshold.

However, Ishikawa, in the same field of endeavor, discloses a detector wherein the determination is based on the number of blocks (see fig. 3) of said current frame, and each time said number is greater than a given threshold (see fig. 4; see column 5, lines 26-60).

Given the teachings as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Ishikawa teachings of determining scene change into Jeannin scene change for determining monochrome image for the benefit of providing an image editing method which can automatically detect a scene change of unknown image information with certainty.

Regarding claim 2, the claim(s) recite analogous limitations to claim 1, and is/are therefore rejected on the same premise.

Regarding claim 3, the claim(s) recite analogous limitations to claim 1, and is/are therefore rejected on the same premise.

Regarding claim 4, the claim(s) recite analogous limitations to claim 1, and is/are therefore rejected on the same premise.

Regarding claim 5, the claim(s) recite analogous limitations to claim 1, and is/are therefore rejected on the same premise.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RICHARD TORRENTE whose telephone number is (571) 270-3702. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/599,611
Art Unit: 2482

Page 10

/Young Lee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2482

/Richard Torrente/
Examiner, Art Unit 2482